Scale Setting for Self-consistent Backgrounds

Benjamin Koch*, Paola Rioseco*, and Carlos Contreras†
*Instituto de Física,
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile,
Av. Vicuña Mackenna 4860, Santiago, Chile
† Departamento de Física,
Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María;
Casilla 110-V, Valparaíso, Chile;

(Dated: January 15, 2015)

The quest for finding self-consistent background solutions in quantum field theory is closely related to the way one decides to set the renormalization scale k. This freedom in the choice of the scale setting can lead to ambiguities and conceptual inconsistencies such as the non-conservation of the stress-energy tensor. In this paper a setting for the "scale-field" is proposed at the level of effective action, which avoids such inconsistencies by construction. The mechanism and its potential is exemplified for scalar ϕ^4 theory and for Einstein-Hilbert-Maxwell theory.

PACS numbers: 04.60., 04.70.

arXiv:1409.4443v3 [hep-th] 14 Jan 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

The effective action approach [1] can be seen as an elegant way of defining a generating functional for one-particle-irreducible Green's functions. Following Wilson's idea [2] one can study the effect of integrated quantum degrees of freedom at different scales k. The scale dependent effective action Γ_k is to be understood as interpolation between the ultraviolet (UV) bare action Γ_∞ and the fully integrated action in the IR Γ_0 as it is sketched in figure 1. Γ_k contains scale dependent couplings g_k^a which are obtained from a suitable flow equation $k\partial_k\Gamma_k = \dots$. The space of solutions g_k^a is called the "coupling flow" [3]. A specific trajectory is selected out of this flow by imposing conditions for the couplings at an initial scale k_0. The evaluation of the effective action Γ_k is typically hampered by various technical difficulties such as singularities, anomalies, and non-localities. However, in many cases those difficulties can be overcome by the "regularization - renormalization" technique, where infinities are absorbed in the initial conditions at a scale k_0. The technical details of this procedure will not be presented here, since they are not relevant for the following discussion. It will be assumed that the effective action Γ_k has already been calculated.

Minimizing a given effective action with respect to variations of its (average) field content ϕ_a gives the equations of motion of the effective action

$$\frac{\delta\Gamma_k}{\delta\phi_a} = 0 \quad . \tag{1}$$

Those equations are typically non-linear and sometimes non-local differential equations and are frequently referred to as "gap equations" [4]. Solutions of those equations have minimal energy (Gibbs free energy in statistical mechanics). Therefore, finding solutions for the "gap equations" is highly relevant for defining a self-consistent background in quantum field theory.

However, even if it is technically possible to solve the "gap equations", the physical interpretation of such a solution is still biased by the way the scale k is related to the quantities x_i, $Q_i, \dots$ (for example positions and charges) that are used to describe the physical system. Choosing a relation $k = k(x_i, Q_i, \dots)$ is called "scale setting". The main focus of this article is on the role of scale setting in the quest of finding self-consistent solutions of (1).

The paper is organized as follows: In section II the approach of improving classical solutions, is studied and a criterion for scale setting is proposed. Section III goes beyond improving classical solutions by studying the "gap equations". A scale setting is proposed in terms of an additional equation of motion. The self-consistency and predictively of this approach is then studied for specific examples such as scalar ϕ^4 theory in section IV and the Einstein-Hilbert-Maxwell action in section V. Conclusions can be found in section VI.

II. A PROBLEM WITH SCALE SETTING IN IMPROVING SOLUTIONS SCHEMES

The method of improving solutions has been successfully applied in many different contexts [5–29]. This intuitive method is potentially useful when perturbation theory has limited reliability such as for strong coupling or for non-renormalizable theories.



FIG. 1: Effective action Γ_k in theory space where ideally $\Lambda \to \infty$ and the dotted line indicates an integration of ϕ_a over momentum degrees of freedom with $p \geq k$.

Instead of turning to one of the particular examples, this approach will be discussed in quite generic fashion. Lets assume a quite general ϕ^4 quantum field theory with bare fields ϕ_i and generic couplings α, g with the equations of motion

$$\mathcal{D}(\alpha\phi_a) + \sum g^{abcd}(\phi_b\phi_c\phi_d) = 0 \quad , \tag{2}$$

where $\mathcal{D}$ is some differential operator (for example $\partial_\mu\partial^\mu$). Lets further assume that the classical solution of (2) is given by

$$\phi_a = \phi_a^0(r, \alpha, g_n, A) \quad , \tag{3}$$

where r are the coordinates and A are integration constants. Renormalization methods allow to calculate quantum corrections to the couplings at arbitrary scale k, such that the couplings of the bare theory become scale dependent quantities (α_k, g_k). How, do those supposedly small quantum corrections modify the form of the classical solution? One approach to address this question is given the improving solutions procedure [5, 6], where one assumes that the classical solution is actually the quantum solution at a certain scale say $k = k_0$. For the case of simplicity lets choose $k_0 = 0$, just as it is done for the electromagnetic coupling in the standard model. At this scale the classical equation of motion

$$\mathcal{D}(\alpha_0\phi_a^0) + \sum g_0^{abcd}(\phi_b^0\phi_c^0\phi_d^0) = 0 \quad , \tag{4}$$

is solved by ϕ_a^0 and the k dependence is a small correction to this solution. In this scheme one assumes that at first order, the functional form of the solution stays unchanged, and only the couplings have to be replaced by the scale dependent couplings in ϕ

$$(\alpha_0,\, g_0) \to (\alpha_k,\, g_k) \quad . \tag{5}$$

Now one makes the ansatz that the classical solution obtains its first order quantum correction only due to the scale dependence of the couplings

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_a &= \phi_a^0(r, \alpha_0, g_0, A) + \frac{d}{dk}\phi_a(r, \alpha_k, g_k, A)|_{k=0} \cdot k + \mathcal{O}(k^2) \quad , \\ \alpha_k &= \alpha_0 + \frac{d}{dk}\alpha_k|_{k=0} \cdot k + \mathcal{O}(k^2) \quad , \\ g_k &= g_0 + \frac{d}{dk}g_k|_{k=0} \cdot k + \mathcal{O}(k^2) \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

The second step is perform a scale setting which relates the arbitrary scale k to the physical coordinates

$$k \to k(r) \quad . \tag{7}$$

The explicit form for this scale setting is however a priory not uniquely determined (in static spherically symmetric problems it has for example been proposed to use $k \sim 1/r$). One first consistency check for this procedure would be to improve the equations of motion (2) in the same way and to check whether the improved solution (6) is actually a solution (up to order k^1) of those equations. Inserting (6) into (2) one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \;&=\; \mathcal{D}(\alpha_0 \phi_a^0) + \sum g_0^{abcd} (\phi_b^0 \phi_c^0 \phi_d^0) \\ &\quad + \mathcal{D}\left[\left(k \frac{d}{dk} \right) (\alpha_k \phi_a)|_{k=0} \right] + \left(k \frac{d}{dk} \right) \sum g_k^{abcd} (\phi_b^k \phi_c^k \phi_d^k)|_{k=0} + \mathcal{O}(k^2) \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Using (4) the first line is identically zero and one obtains that the second line has to be zero too, if one wants to insist on the improved equations. In most of the articles cited above it was not imposed that the improved equations of motion stay valid and the scale setting was performed basically based on dimensional analysis. At this point an important questions arises: "Is the coupling α_k inside or outside the square brackets of the differential operator $\mathcal{D}$?" This is a priory not clear since starting from the equation of motion (4) both alternatives would be equally possible. However, this question can be "answered" (or say evaded) if one imposes a particular scale setting (7) such that the differential operator commutes with the scale function

$$[\mathcal{D}, k(r)] = 0 \quad . \tag{9}$$

In this case the second line of (8) is equivalent to

$$0 \;=\; \left(k \frac{d}{dk} \right) \left[\mathcal{D}\left[\phi_a^k \right] + \sum \alpha_k^{-1} g_k^{abcd} (\phi_b^k \phi_c^k \phi_d^k) \right] \Big|_{k=0} + \mathcal{O}(k^2) \quad . \tag{10}$$

Thus, the remaining task would be first solving (9) for k and then solving (10) for ϕ_i^k.

The fact that (9) can actually serve as a useful way of defining a scale setting can be seen from a simple example: For the three dimensional Laplace operator with spherical symmetry, the condition (9) reads

$$\left[\frac{1}{r^2} \partial_r (r^2 \partial_r),\; k(r) \right] = 0 \quad . \tag{11}$$

It is solved for $r \neq 0$ by

$$k(r) = \frac{\xi}{r} \quad , \tag{12}$$

which indeed agrees perfectly with the ad-hoc intuition coming from a dimensional analysis.

However, there is (at least) one other consistency condition one would like to impose, the conservation of the stress-energy tensor, even at the quantum-improved level. Let $T^0_{\mu\nu}$ be the classically conserved stress-energy tensor

$$\nabla^\mu T^0_{\mu\nu} = 0 \quad , \tag{13}$$

then the straight forward improved stress-energy tensor would be taken to be

$$T_{\mu\nu} = T^0_{\mu\nu} + \left(\frac{d}{dk} T^k_{\mu\nu}|_{k=0} \right) \cdot k + \mathcal{O}(k^2) \quad . \tag{14}$$

Imposing conservation of (14) and using (13) one finds to leading order in k

$$\nabla^\mu T_{\mu\nu} = \nabla^\mu \left(\left(\frac{d}{dk} T^k_{\mu\nu}|_{k=0} \right) \cdot k \right) \equiv 0 \quad . \tag{15}$$

If one would try to solve this problem in the same spirit as (9) by imposing $[\nabla^\mu, k(r)] \equiv 0$ one easily finds that this is overly restrictive allowing only for trivial solutions. To circumvent this problem one can modify the definition (5) of the stress-energy tensor (for example by using a different equation of state [25]) but such an ad-hoc redefinition is not completely satisfactory.

To summarize, one sees that the method of improved solutions (8) can be made consistent, even at the level of improved equations of motions if one imposes an adequate scale setting (9) (for example $k \sim 1/r$ for the spherical symmetric Laplacian). However, it has limitations in the sense that this procedure raises questions in the context of symmetries and conservation laws and that it is restricted to first order corrections only.

This can be taken as motivation for seeking a more elegant way for obtaining a description in the context of scale dependent couplings.

III. THE PROPOSAL: SCALE-FIELD SETTING AT THE LEVEL OF EFFECTIVE ACTION

In the previous section it was shown how scale setting can be realized in the improving solutions approach. In this section a more general scale setting at the level of effective action will be proposed.

Lets assume that within the quantum field theoretical model it was possible, to evaluate the corresponding coupling flow and to select a particular trajectory due to the choice of initial conditions ($g_i(k_0) = g_{i,0}$). Thus, one can start with the effective quantum action [1]

$$\Gamma_k(\phi_a(x), \partial\phi_a(x), g_k^a) = \int d^4x\sqrt{-g}\mathcal{L}(\phi_a(x), \partial\phi_a(x), g_k^a) \quad , \tag{16}$$

where ϕ_a are actually the expectation values of the quantum fields and g_k^a are the scale dependent couplings, including the coupling multiplying the kinetic term that is frequently expressed in terms of field renormalization (see the first two subsections of IV).

Note that doing this, one frequently has to truncate higher order- or nonlocal couplings [30–32] from the model, that might appear due to the quantum integration procedure. In the following discussion it will however be assumed that all relevant couplings are taken into account. Now, one can derive the equations of motion for the average quantum fields ϕ_a from

$$\frac{\delta\Gamma_k}{\delta\phi_a} = 0 \quad . \tag{17}$$

As mentioned in the introduction, the solutions $\bar{\phi}_a(x,k)$ of those "gap equations" will also be functions of the arbitrary scale k. From a physical point of view this is however not yet satisfactory since no possible observable can be a function of an a priory arbitrary scale. In order to obtain a physical quantity one has to define some kind of scale setting procedure, that establishes a relation between the physical quantities (charges Q_i and positions x_j) of a given problem and the scale k. When doing this one can borrow an idea from the calculation of observables $\langle T\phi(x_i)\dots\rangle_k$ in standard quantum field theory. Also there, the observables turn out to be scale "k" dependent quantities[1]. Subsequently, the scale setting for those observables in terms of initial conditions and kinematical variables $k = k(x_i;\ Q_i\dots)$ is chosen such that any k dependence of the time ordered correlation function (or some other observable) is minimized

$$\frac{d}{dk}\langle T\phi_1(x_1)\phi_2(x_2)\dots\rangle_k\Big|_{k=k_{opt}} \equiv 0 \quad . \tag{18}$$

This is the key philosophy that is used when deriving the "Callan-Symanzik" equations [33, 34], the "principal of minimal sensitivity [35], or the "principle of maximal conformality" [36, 37].

It is proposed to implement an analogous philosophy at the level of the effective action Γ_k. This means that one should choose an optimal scale setting prescription for which a variation of k has a minimal impact on the self-consistent background $\bar{\phi}_i$. This principle can be implemented by promoting the a priory arbitrary scale to a physical scale-field in the effective quantum action

$$\Gamma_k(\phi_a(x), \partial\phi_a(x), g_k^a) \to \Gamma(\phi_a(x), \partial\phi_a(x), k(x), g_k^a) \quad . \tag{19}$$

This leads to the coupled equations of motion

$$\frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta\phi_a} = 0 \quad , \quad \frac{d}{dk}\mathcal{L}(\phi_a(x), \partial\phi_a(x), k(x), g_k^a)\Big|_{k=k_{opt}} = 0 \quad . \tag{20}$$

Clearly it is not guaranteed that a solution for (20) can be found, but such a prescription is not limited to be a variation of a classical solution or to a saddle point approximation. The procedure (20) has already been applied for some particular gravitational actions [13, 28, 38–40] but in this work it is discussed in a broader context. A nice feature of such a procedure is that any solution of the equations (20) is automatically independent of k, which is actually the fundamental precondition for a physical observable in the language of the renormalization group approach.

Promoting the scale k to a scale-field $k(x)$ raises the question whether this new field only appears in the couplings g_k^a, or whether it has to be equipped with other additional couplings, for instance a proper kinetic term. A standard

[1] It is, argued that this k dependence is an artifact of the truncation in the loop expansion

procedure when introducing new fields into a Lagrangian is to incorporate actually all couplings that are in agreement with the symmetry of the Lagrangian. This abundant freedom is then restricted by imposing some other additional conditions such as renormalizability, simplicity, and/or agreement with experimental constraints. However, in the presented approach the philosophy is different. The scale-field k is understood to have its origin in the process of renormalization and throughout this process, no such extra couplings are taken into account. In particular, the beta functions of the couplings g_k^a are calculated without any additional couplings. Therefore, the presented version of scale-field setting is chosen in a sense "minimal", since it contemplates the appearance of $k(x)$ only as dictated by the running couplings g_k^a.

Even though the prescription (19) looks quite convincing from this perspective, it might be insufficient for example in the sense that the space of solutions of (20) is actually empty, apart from a trivial configuration or it is insufficient in the sense that the conservation of the stress-energy tensor can not be guaranteed either. Therefore, the idea will be studied for some examples, where self-consistency of the approach can be shown explicitly.

IV. SCALE-FIELD SETTING FOR SCALAR ϕ^4 THEORY

As most simple example without any further complications due to gauge symmetry lets study the scale-field setting procedure for scalar ϕ^4 theory. There are various ways of writing the effective action for ϕ^4 theory. One of them is in terms of a scale dependent wave function renormalization Z_k, running mass m_k, and running quartic coupling g_k. The other way of writing this action is terms of separate couplings for every term appearing in the Lagrangian, which are a coupling for the kinetic term α_k, a coupling for the ϕ^2 term $\tilde{m}_k^2$, and a coupling for the quartic term $\tilde{g}_k$. As long as the scale k is assumed to be fixed, the formalism for both is exactly equivalent. However, in the context of scale-field setting $k \to k(x)$, derivatives do not necessarily commute with $k(x)$ and both formulations could to be treated differently. This subtlety will be exemplified in the following subsection, before applying the scale setting to ϕ^4 theory at the one loop level.

A. Consistency in scalar ϕ^4 theory

If one works with separate couplings for every term appearing in the Lagrangian, including the kinetic term, the effective action is

$$\Gamma = \int d^4x \left(\frac{\alpha_k}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{\tilde{m}_k^2}{2}\phi^2 - \frac{\tilde{g}_k}{4!}\phi^4 \right) \tag{21}$$

with two fields ϕ and k. The couplings α_k, $\tilde{m}_k^2$, and $\tilde{g}_k$ are functions of the field k. This implies an equation of motion for $\delta\phi$:

$$\partial_\mu(\alpha_k \partial^\mu\phi) + \tilde{m}_k^2\phi + \frac{\tilde{g}_k}{6}\phi^3 = 0 \tag{22}$$

and an other equation of motion for k:

$$\alpha_k'(\partial\phi)^2 - (\tilde{m}_k^2)'\phi^2 - \frac{1}{12}\tilde{g}_k'\phi^4 = 0 \quad , \tag{23}$$

where $\alpha' = \partial_k\alpha = (\partial_x\alpha)dx/dk$.

The conserved energy momentum tensor is obtained as variation with respect to the metric tensor

$$T_{\mu\nu} = \alpha_k(\partial_\mu\phi)(\partial_\nu\phi) - g_{\mu\nu}\left(\frac{\alpha_k}{2}(\partial\phi)^2 - \frac{\tilde{m}_k^2}{2}\phi^2 - \frac{\tilde{g}_k}{4!}\phi^4 \right) \quad . \tag{24}$$

The corresponding conservation law reads

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \partial^\mu T_{\mu\nu} \\ &= \partial^\mu(\alpha_k\partial_\mu\phi)\partial_\nu\phi + \alpha_k(\partial_\mu\phi)\partial^\mu\partial_\nu\phi - \frac{1}{2}\partial_\nu\left(\alpha_k(\partial\phi)^2 - \tilde{m}_k^2\phi^2 - \frac{\tilde{g}_k}{12}\phi^4 \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\left(\alpha_k'(\partial\phi)^2 - (\tilde{m}_k^2)'\phi^2 - \frac{1}{12}\tilde{g}_k'\phi^4 \right)\cdot\partial_\nu k \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where in the second line the ϕ equation of motion (22) was used. One easily observes that (25) is identical to the equation of motion for k (23). This shows that the approach at the level of effective action (20) is on the one hand implementing the idea of minimal scale dependence and on the other hand maintaining the validity of improved equations of motion and the fundamental conservation law (see section II).

Instead of writing a coupling for the kinetic term one frequently works with wave function renormalization where the bare field is $\phi_B = \sqrt{Z_k}\phi$. In this case one could simply identify $\alpha_k = Z_k$, $\tilde{m}_k^2 = Z_k m_k^2$, and $\tilde{g}_k = g_k Z_k^2$ and observe that the corresponding effective action is completely equivalent to (21). However, if one allows for field valued scales $k = k(x)$, this identification is not the only possibility, since the derivatives of the kinetic term, acting on the scale field might contribute to the action. Still, even in this case it can be shown that the scale setting procedure is consistent with the conservation law, just like in (25).

B. Scale-field setting in the one loop expansion of ϕ^4 theory

The loop expansion of ϕ^4 theory has been calculated up to high order in perturbation theory [41]. For the following example will be restricted to the one-loop expansion of the beta functions (see [42])

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_Z &= \frac{d\ln Z_k}{d\ln k^2} = 0 \quad , \\ \beta_g &= \frac{dg_k}{d\ln k} = \frac{3}{16\pi^2} g_k^2 \quad , \\ \beta_{m^2} &= \frac{dm_k^2}{d\ln k} = (-2 + \frac{g_k}{16\pi^2}) m_k^2 \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Now one can integrate those flow equations with initial conditions for $k = k_0$

$$Z_{k_0} \equiv 1 \quad \text{and} \quad g_{k_0} = g_0 \quad \text{and} \quad m_{k_0}^2 = m_0^2 \quad . \tag{27}$$

This determines the particular flow trajectory

$$\begin{aligned} Z_k &= 1 \quad , \\ g_k &= \frac{g_0}{1 - \frac{3}{16\pi^2} g_0 \ln(k/k_0)} \quad , \\ m_k^2 &= \frac{k_0^2}{k^2} \frac{m_0^2}{\left(1 - \frac{3}{16\pi^2} g_0 \log(k/k_0)\right)^{1/3}} = \frac{k_0^2 m_0^2}{k^2} \left(\frac{g_k}{g_0}\right)^{1/3} \quad . \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

In order to maintain legibility, the subscript of the scale dependent couplings will be omitted ($m_k^2 \to m^2$ and $g_k \to g$) in the following calculation. Due to the constant wave function renormalization, the equation of motion for ϕ simplifies to

$$\partial^2\phi + m^2\phi + \frac{g}{6}\phi^3 = 0 \tag{29}$$

and the scale setting equation of motion (23) simplifies to

$$\phi^3 g' + 12\phi (m^2)' = 0 \quad . \tag{30}$$

The two equations of motion (29) and (30) have to be solved for the two functions k and ϕ. One way to approach this, is to first solve (30) as non-differential equation for ϕ^2 giving

$$\phi^2 = 4\frac{k_0^2 m_0^2}{k^2} \frac{(32\pi^2 - g)}{g^2} \left(\frac{g}{g_0}\right)^{(1/3)} \quad . \tag{31}$$

This can now be inserted into (29) inducing a second order differential equation for the scale setting, which after using the running couplings (28) reads

$$\begin{aligned} A_k \Bigg[\left(4(4\pi)^8 + 11(4\pi)^6 g - \frac{(4\pi)^4}{12} g^2 + 40 g^3 - g^4\right) (\partial k)^2 - 8\pi^2 \left(\frac{(4\pi)^6}{4} + \frac{(4\pi)^4}{6} g - 96\pi^2 g^2 + g^3\right) k \cdot \partial^2 k \Bigg] \\ + \frac{2k_0^3 m_0^2 (g + 64\pi^2)}{3 g^2 (g_0/g)^{1/3} k^3} \sqrt{(m_0^2(32\pi^2 - g))(g/g_0)^{1/3}} \;=\; 0 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where

$$A_k = \frac{k_0}{64\pi^2 g^{5/6} k^3 (-32\pi^2 + g)^2} \sqrt{\frac{m_0^2 (32\pi^2 - g)}{g_0^{1/3}}} \quad . \tag{33}$$

Within the validity of the beta functions (28), which corresponds to first order in g_0, this equation simplifies after the cancelation of a global factor to

$$k_0^2 m_0^2 \left(64\pi^2 - 3g_0 - 56 g_0 \ln(k/k_0)\right) + 6 g_0 (\partial k)^2 - 3 g_0 k \partial^2 k = 0 \quad . \tag{34}$$

The use of this relation, in terms of scale setting, will now be exemplified for a specific system:

For static spherical symmetry the only allowed coordinate dependence is with respect to the radial distance $k = k(r)$. In this case (34) reads

$$k_0^2 m_0^2 \left(64\pi^2 - 3g_0 - 56 g_0 \ln(k/k_0)\right) - 6 g_0 (\partial_r k)^2 + \frac{3 g_0 k}{r^2} (2 r \partial_r k + r^2 \partial_r^2 k) = 0 \quad . \tag{35}$$

Due to the non-trivial structure of the differential operator it is hard to find a general solution of (35) but one observes that, if $k_0 \neq 0$, this equation has actually a constant solution,

$$k_i = k_0 \exp\left(-\frac{3}{56} + \frac{8\pi^2}{7 g_0}\right) \quad . \tag{36}$$

From this expression one finds that demanding that $k_i = k_0 \neq 0$ would imply $g_0 \approx 210$, which is clearly not in the validity range of the small g_0 approximation. Thus, it is safe to say that $k_i \neq k_0$. One can now investigate the scale setting in the vicinity of this constant scale k_i

$$k(r) = k_i + \delta k(r) + \mathcal{O}\left(\delta k^2\right) \quad . \tag{37}$$

Inserting this in (35) and expanding to first order in δk one obtains a simpler differential equation for the radial dependence of the scale-field

$$56 m_0^2 r \delta k - 3 \frac{k_i^2}{k_0^2} \left(2 \partial_r \delta k + r \partial_r^2 \delta k\right) = 0 \quad . \tag{38}$$

This differential equation can be directly solved by

$$\delta k(r) = \exp\left(-2\sqrt{\frac{14}{3}} \frac{k_0}{k_i} m_0 r\right) \frac{c_1}{r} + \exp\left(+2\sqrt{\frac{14}{3}} \frac{k_0}{k_i} m_0 r\right) \frac{c_2}{r} \quad , \tag{39}$$

where c_1 and c_2 are the constants of integration. They have to be set by additional conditions, for example one might impose that δk does not diverge for large radii, which implies that $c_2 = 0$. The scale-field setting is then

$$k(r) = k_i + \exp\left(-2\sqrt{\frac{14}{3}} \frac{k_0}{k_i} m_0 r\right) \cdot \frac{c_1}{r} \quad . \tag{40}$$

One notes that (40) actually reproduces the standard $1/r$ behavior for very small radii, but it has two additional features with respect to the naive guess. The first difference consists in the constant factor, which might be suppressed for the case of a small scale k_0 in the initial conditions (27). The second difference is an exponential suppression factor which is controlled by the mass m_0 and by the value of g_0. In figure 2 this r dependence of the scale setting is shown in comparison to the usual setting $k \sim 1/r$. The figure confirms the intuitive behavior for small r and shows the exponential suppression for larger r. Please note that the exercise was made in order to study the scale setting $k(r)$ and that in a more complete analysis, also the stability and the finiteness of the corresponding solution for $\phi(r)$ has to be studied.

V. SCALE-FIELD SETTING FOR EINSTEIN HILBERT MAXWELL ACTION

A. Consistency in Einstein Hilbert Maxwell case

In order to show the consistency of the proposed scale setting, with conservation laws in a less-trivial example, one can study the approach for gravity coupled to a $U(1)$ gauge field and to a cosmological constant. Gravity is exemplary



FIG. 2: Radial dependence of the scale setting (40) in comparison to the naive $1/r$ setting (dashed curve). The parameters used for the plot are $m_0 = 1$ GeV, $g_0 = 0.5$, $c_1 = 1$, $c_2 = 0$, and $k_0 = 0$.

for a non-trivial field theory that is notoriously perturbatively not renormalizable and the situation becomes even less favorable when it is coupled to matter. Still, there exist non-perturbative methods that allow to calculate effective actions and scale dependent couplings for this theory [31, 43–61].

Therefore, it is reasonable to investigate the proposed scale setting procedure in the context of a gravitational action coupled to matter. As example for such a coupled gravitational system the Einstein-Hilbert-Maxwell action will be discussed

$$\Gamma_k[g_{\mu\nu}, A_\alpha] \;=\; \int_M d^4x\sqrt{-g}\left(\frac{R-2\Lambda_k}{16\pi G_k} - \frac{1}{4e_k^2}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}\right) \quad , \tag{41}$$

where R is the Ricci scalar and $F_{\mu\nu} = D_\mu A_\nu - D_\nu A_\mu$ is the antisymmetric electromagnetic field strength tensor. The scale dependent couplings are thus, Newtons coupling G_k, the cosmological coupling Λ_k, and the electromagnetic coupling e_k. Please note that the flow of those couplings has been derived non-perturbatively in [59]. As in (19, 20) the scale k^2 will be considered as field without kinetic term. The equations of motion for the metric field in (41) are

$$G_{\mu\nu} = -g_{\mu\nu}\Lambda_k - \Delta t_{\mu\nu} + 8\frac{\pi G_k}{e_k^2}T_{\mu\nu} \quad , \tag{42}$$

where the possible coordinate dependence of G_k induces an additional contribution to the stress-energy tensor [48]

$$\Delta t_{\mu\nu} = G_k\left(g_{\mu\nu}\Box - \nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu\right)\frac{1}{G_k} \quad . \tag{43}$$

Further, the stress-energy tensor for the electromagnetic part is given by

$$T_{\mu\nu} = F_\nu{}^\alpha F_{\mu\alpha} - \frac{1}{4}g_{\mu\nu}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} \quad . \tag{44}$$

The equations of motion (Maxwell equations) for this $U(1)$ gauge field are

$$D_\mu\left(\frac{1}{e_k^2}F^{\mu\nu}\right) = 0 \quad , \tag{45}$$

and finally the equations of motion for the scale-field k are

$$\left[R\nabla_\mu\left(\frac{1}{G_k}\right) - 2\nabla_\mu\left(\frac{\Lambda_k}{G_k}\right) - \nabla_\mu\left(\frac{4\pi}{e_k^2}\right)F_{\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\beta}\right]\cdot(\partial^\mu k) = 0 \quad . \tag{46}$$

The above equations of motion are complemented by the relations corresponding to gauge invariance of the system. For the case of diffeomorphism invariance one has

$$\nabla^\mu G_{\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{47}$$

and for the internal $U(1)$ gauge symmetry the corresponding equations are

$$\nabla_{[\mu}F_{\alpha\beta]} = 0 \quad . \tag{48}$$

Please note that one has to work with (48) and not with $\nabla_{[\mu}e^{-1}F_{\alpha\beta]} = 0$ since the factor e^{-2} appears explicitly in the action (41) and not in the covariant derivatives.

The new ingredient due to the scale-field is the equation (46), therefore it is important to check whether this equation is actually non-trivial and consistent with the equations (42 and 45). The consistency can be shown by explicitly deriving (46) from (42 and 45) and further imposing that the gauge symmetries reflected by (47 and 48) are maintained. Starting from (42) one imposes (47)

$$\nabla^\mu G_{\mu\nu} = 0 = -g_{\mu\nu}\Lambda_k'\partial^\mu K + \nabla^\mu \Delta t_{\mu\nu} + 8\pi G_k' e_k^{-2} T_{\mu\nu}\partial^\mu K + 8\pi G_k \nabla^\mu \left(e_k^{-2}T_{\mu\nu}\right) \tag{49}$$

using

$$\nabla^\mu \left(\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu - \Box g_{\mu\nu}\right)\frac{1}{G_k} = R_{\mu\nu}\nabla^\mu\frac{1}{G_k} \tag{50}$$

one can factorize a $(\partial^\mu k)$ in the whole expression except of a single term involving the electromagnetic stress-energy tensor

$$0 = \left[-g_{\mu\nu}G_k\Lambda_k' + G_k'\left(G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda_k g_{\mu\nu} - 8\pi e_k^{-2}G_k T_{\mu\nu}\right) - R_{\mu\nu}G_k' + 8\pi G_k' G_k e_k^{-2}T_{\mu\nu}\right](\partial^\mu k) + 8\pi {G_k}^2\nabla^\mu\left(e_k^{-2}T_{\mu\nu}\right) \quad . \tag{51}$$

However, by using (48) and the antisymmetry of $F_{\mu\nu}$ one can show that $(\partial^\mu k)$ can also be factorized from this term

$$\nabla^\mu\left(e_k^{-2}T_{\mu\nu}\right) = \left[-\frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{4}(e_k^{-2})' F_{\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\beta}\right](\partial^\mu k) \quad . \tag{52}$$

Thus, one has

$$0 = \left[-g_{\mu\nu}G_k\Lambda_k' + G_k'\left(G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda_k g_{\mu\nu} - 8\pi e_k^{-2}G_k T_{\mu\nu}\right) - R_{\mu\nu}G_k' + 8\pi G_k' G_k e_k^{-2}T_{\mu\nu} - 8\pi {G_k}^2\frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{4}(e_k^{-2})' F_{\alpha\beta}F^{\alpha\beta}\right](\partial^\mu k) \quad . \tag{53}$$

Since in this proof, there has no scale setting $k \to k(x)$ been applied yet, one can choose any direction for the vector $(\partial^\mu k)$ and still the above relation has to hold. The only non-trivial way for this to happen is that the quantity in squared brackets has to vanish. Tracing this quantity over its two indices one gets

$$0 = 2\frac{\Lambda_k'}{G_k} + \frac{G_k'\left(R - 2\Lambda_k\right)}{G_k^2} + 4\pi\left((e_k^{-2})' F^2\right) \quad , \tag{54}$$

which is indeed identical to (46).

Therefore, the equation of motion (46) is indeed consistent with the other equations of motion of the system (42 and 45) in combination with the symmetry relations (47 and 48). This consistency does not guarantee that the system has physically reasonable and non-trivial solutions. But it confirms again that, even for gauge and gravitational systems, the approach at the level of effective action (20) is on the one hand an elegant way of minimizing scale setting ambiguities and on the other hand maintaining the validity of improved equations of motion and the fundamental conservation laws of the effective action (see section II).

Please note that given the fact that the functional form of the scale dependent couplings G_k, Λ_k, and e_k is in most known cases highly non-trivial [59] one can hardly expect to obtain an analytical solution of the equations (42 and 45). However, in [62] it will be shown that with just one simplifying assumption it is actually possible to find meaningful black hole solutions for two different truncations of (41).

B. Integrating out the scale-field: UV scale-field setting for Einstein Hilbert Maxwell action in Asymptotic Safety

Since in the proposed method, the scale k is actually a scale field and since fields can be integrated out of an effective action by solving their equations of motion and inserting back into the action, $k(x)$ can be treated in the same way. By this, the method (19) can actually be used in order to construct a scale - independent effective action $\tilde{\Gamma}$, by integrating out $k(x)$ of the scale dependent action Γ_k. In a general setting one proceeds by first solving the equation of motion for k in momentum space

$$\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial k} = \partial_\mu\frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial k_{,\mu}} \quad , \tag{55}$$



FIG. 3: Coupling flow projected to the dimensionless gravitational coupling g and the electromagnetic coupling e^2. The arrows point in direction of increasing k.

giving $k = k(\phi)$. This can be inserted it back into the effective action which then gives

$$\Gamma(\phi, k) \to \Gamma(\phi, k(\phi)) = \tilde{\Gamma}(\phi) \quad . \tag{56}$$

By this procedure one can "integrate out" the scale-field k and one obtains a new effective action $\tilde{\Gamma}(\phi)$ which is a function of ϕ only. This new scale free effective action differs from the original effective action $\Gamma_k(\phi)$ in the sense that it automatically contains a self-consistent scale setting.

Lets exemplify this with the Einstein Hilbert Maxwell action (41). In the deep UV limit ($k \to \infty$) there is strong evidence [44, 45, 47] for the existence of a non-Gaussian fixed point for the two gravitational couplings

$$\begin{aligned} G_k &\approx \frac{g^*}{k^2} \quad , \\ \Lambda_k &\approx \lambda^* k^2 \quad , \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

and there exists further evidence for (at least) one UV fixed point for the electromagnetic couplings [59]

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{e^2_{k,2}} \approx \frac{1}{e^{*2}_2} \quad . \tag{58}$$

Since this fixed point in the electromagnetic coupling is not an attractor it is only approached by particular trajectories in the corresponding flow. Other trajectories either run into a Landau pole type of divergence at finite k, or they run to vanishing values of $e_{k,1}$ at infinite k [59]

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{1}{e^2_{k,1}} \approx \frac{1}{e^{*2}_1} \cdot (k^2)^B \quad . \tag{59}$$

The value of the exponentiating factor B for the second fixed point depends on the method of calculation. Since the numerical value of B ranges from 0.8 to 1.6 [59], in this example the simplest possibility of $B \equiv 1$ will be chosen. The behavior of this flow projection using the functions of [59] is shown in figure 3. One observes three fixed points in this flow: Apart from the Gaussian fixed point at vanishing couplings one sees, one fixed point with finite g^* but vanishing e^2 (labeled Γ_1), which corresponds to the limit (59), and an other fixed point with finite g^* and e^2 (labeled Γ_2), which corresponds to the limit (58). In order to integrate out the scale-field from the effective action (41) one has to solve the corresponding equation of motion (46) for k^2. In the UV limit (57) one finds for the fixed point in (58)

$$k^2_2|_{UV} = \frac{R}{4\lambda^*} \tag{60}$$

and for the asymptotic behavior (59) one finds in the same limit

$$k_1^2|_{UV} = \frac{R - \frac{4\pi g^*}{e_1^{*2}} F^2}{4\lambda^*} \quad . \tag{61}$$

Those field-scale settings relate the UV scale k^2 proportional to the curvature scalar R, in agreement to what is frequently intuited in the literature [29, 63–66]. But the relations (60, 61) go beyond this intuition since they also determine the constant proportionality factor and possible modifications due to the electromagnetic field strength.

Now follows the "integrating out" (56), where the scale-field is eliminated from the original action. The effective actions valid in the deep UV are obtained, from (41) after using again the approximation (57). For the fixed point in (58) and the corresponding scale setting (60) this gives

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{UV,2} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{R^2}{128\,\pi g^* \lambda^*} - \frac{F^2}{4 e_2^{*2}} \right] \quad . \tag{62}$$

For the asymptotic behavior (59) and the corresponding scale setting (61) the UV effective action results to be

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_{UV,1} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{\left(R - \frac{4\pi g^*}{e_1^{*2}} F^2 \right)^2}{128\,\pi g^* \lambda^*} \right] \quad . \tag{63}$$

One observes that for vanishing $F^2 = 0$, the R^2 dependence of the UV effective action in Asymptotic Safe gravity, which is indeed renormalizable [67], is recovered in agreement with other studies in the literature [29, 64, 65]. However, in addition to this expectable result, the scale-field procedure in combination with integrating out the additional k-field dependence, allowed to predict a generalization of those results to the coupling to a finite electromagnetic field strength $F^2 \neq 0$. Those UV results confirm that the fixed points (58) and (59) correspond to different physical systems with different effective equations of motion for the background. Therefore, the UV behavior of the self-consistent background, which is solution of one of those equations of motion, can be largely different for different trajectories, depending on the fixed point which is approached by a specific trajectory in the RG flow (see figure 3).

VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this paper the problem of scale setting in the context of finding self-consistent solutions of the effective action - "gap equations" was discussed. First, the procedure of improving solutions for non-perturbative problems was reviewed by the use of a quite generic example. It was shown that one might define a scale setting (9) that keeps consistency at the level of improved equations of motion, but it was also shown that usually the conservation of the stress-energy tensor can not be guaranteed throughout the improving solutions procedure.

Then, in section III a novel procedure for the scale setting is proposed, by promoting the scale k to a scale-field $k(x)$ at the level of effective action Γ. This proposal is the essential idea of the presented work.

In order to demonstrate the functionality of the new procedure, the following sections are devoted to discuss the approach for emblematic field theories. As first example scalar ϕ^4 theory is discussed and the consistent conservation of the stress-energy tensor, even after the scale setting, is shown explicitly. The self-consistency is shown for two common forms of the ϕ^4 effective action. In order to complement this general result, by a more practical example, an approximated self-consistent scale setting for spherically symmetric backgrounds in ϕ^4 theory is calculated at the one loop level.

In its generality the scale-field method is not limited to the simple scalar ϕ^4 model. Instead it is expected to work for a very broad class of theories. For example, it also is meant to work in the context of much richer gauge theories. This much broader applicability is exemplified by studying the scale setting prescription in gravity coupled to an electromagnetic stress-energy tensor, represented by Einstein-Hilbert-Maxwell theory. It is explicitly shown that also in this example the conservation of a generalized stress-energy tensor is guaranteed by the scale-field setting. As application, the UV scale-field setting of Asymptotically Safe gravity coupled to an electromagnetic field strength is calculated and the scale independent effective action (valid in the UV) of this theory is derived by integrating the scale-field out. Finally, we would like to mention that the idea is not limited to background calculations, but it should also be applicable to scale setting problems in scattering theory in the conventional Feynman sense.

Acknowledgements

The work of B.K. was supported by proj. Fondecyt 1120360 and anillo Atlas Andino 10201. C.C was supported by proj. Fondecyt 1120360 and DGIP-UTFSM grant 11.13.12. The work of P.R. was supported by beca de doctorado Conicyt. We acknowledge Frank Saueressig, Jorge Alfaro, Maximo Banados, Gorazd Cvetic, and Marco Aurelio Diaz for valuable discussions. We further acknowledge the help of C. Gonzalez Díaz in producing figure 3.

[1] S. R. Coleman and E. J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **7**, 1888 (1973).
[2] K. G. Wilson, Rev. Mod. Phys. **47**, 773 (1975).
[3] M. Gell-Mann and F. E. Low, Phys. Rev. **95**, 1300 (1954).
[4] J. Avan and H. J. de Vega, Phys. Rev. D **29**, 2891 (1984).
[5] E.A. Uehling Phys. Rev. **48**, 55 (1935).
[6] A. Bonanno and M. Reuter, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 084011 (1999); gr-qc/9811026.
[7] A. Bonanno and M. Reuter, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 043008 (2000); hep-th/0002196.
[8] H. Emoto, hep-th/0511075.
[9] A. Bonanno and M. Reuter, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 083005 (2006); hep-th/0602159.
[10] B. F. L. Ward, Acta Phys. Polon. B **37**, 1967 (2006); hep-ph/0605054.
[11] K. Falls, D. F. Litim and A. Raghuraman, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **27**, 1250019 (2012); arXiv:1002.0260.
[12] S. Basu and D. Mattingly, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 124017 (2010); arXiv:1006.0718.
[13] C. Contreras, B. Koch and P. Rioseco, Class. Quant. Grav. **30**, 175009 (2013) [arXiv:1303.3892 [astro-ph.CO]].
[14] M. Reuter and E. Tuiran, hep-th/0612037.
[15] M. Reuter and E. Tuiran, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 044041 (2011); arXiv:1009.3528.
[16] Y.-F. Cai and D. A. Easson, JCAP **1009**, 002 (2010); arXiv:1007.1317.
[17] A. M. Frolov and D. M. Wardlaw, European Physical Journal B 85, 348 - 351 (2012) [arXiv:1110.3433 [nucl-th]]; A. M. Frolov, arXiv:1111.2303 [math-ph].
[18] K. Falls and D. F. Litim, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 084002 (2014) [arXiv:1212.1821 [gr-qc]].
[19] J. Hewett and T. Rizzo, JHEP **0712**, 009 (2007); arXiv:0707.3182.
[20] D. F. Litim and T. Plehn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 131301 (2008); arXiv:0707.3983.
[21] B. Koch, Phys. Lett. B **663**, 334 (2008); arXiv:0707.4644.
[22] T. Burschil and B. Koch, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **92**, 219 (2010); arXiv:0912.4517.
[23] A. Contillo, M. Hindmarsh and C. Rahmede, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 043501 (2012) [arXiv:1108.0422 [gr-qc]].
[24] Y. -F. Cai and D. A. Easson, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 103502 (2011) [arXiv:1107.5815 [hep-th]].
[25] M. Hindmarsh, D. Litim and C. Rahmede, JCAP **1107**, 019 (2011) [arXiv:1101.5401 [gr-qc]].
[26] B. Koch and F. Saueressig, Class. Quant. Grav. **31**, 015006 (2014) [arXiv:1306.1546 [hep-th]].
[27] D. F. Litim and K. Nikolakopoulos, JHEP **1404**, 021 (2014) [arXiv:1308.5630 [hep-th]].
[28] B. Koch, C. Contreras, P. Rioseco and F. Saueressig, arXiv:1311.1121 [hep-th].
[29] B. Koch and F. Saueressig, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **29**, no. 8, 1430011 (2014) [arXiv:1401.4452 [hep-th]].
[30] M. Reuter and F. Saueressig, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 125001 (2002) [hep-th/0206145].
[31] P. F. Machado and F. Saueressig, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 124045 (2008), arXiv:0712.0445.
[32] A. Codello, Annals Phys. **325**, 1727 (2010) [arXiv:1004.2171 [hep-th]].
[33] C. G. Callan, Jr., Phys. Rev. D **2**, 1541 (1970).
[34] K. Symanzik, Commun. Math. Phys. **18**, 227 (1970).
[35] P. M. Stevenson, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 2916 (1981).
[36] S. J. Brodsky, G. P. Lepage and P. B. Mackenzie, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 228 (1983).
[37] S. J. Brodsky and L. Di Giustino, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 085026 (2012) [arXiv:1107.0338 [hep-ph]].
[38] B. Koch and I. Ramirez, Class. Quant. Grav. **28**, 055008 (2011) [arXiv:1010.2799 [gr-qc]].
[39] S. Domazet and H. Stefancic, Class. Quant. Grav. **29**, 235005 (2012) [arXiv:1204.1483 [gr-qc]].
[40] Davi C. Rodrigues, Benjamin Koch, Oliver F. Piattella, and Ilya L. Shapiro Proceedings 5 Verao Quantico, 2014.
[41] H. Kleinert, J. Neu, V. Schulte-Frohlinde, K. G. Chetyrkin and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **272**, 39 (1991) [Erratum-ibid. B **319**, 545 (1993)] [hep-th/9503230].
[42] Michael E. Peskin, Daniel V. Schroeder, "An Introduction to Quantum Field Theory", Westview press, 1995.
[43] D. Dou and R. Percacci, Class. Quant. Grav. **15**, 3449 (1998), hep-th/9707239.
[44] W. Souma, Prog. Theor. Phys. **102**, 181 (1999), hep-th/9907027.
[45] M. Reuter and F. Saueressig, Phys. Rev. D**65**, 065016 (2002), hep-th/0110054.
[46] O. Lauscher and M. Reuter, Class. Quant. Grav. **19**, 483 (2002), hep-th/0110021.
[47] D. F. Litim, Phys. Rev. D**64**, 105007 (2001), hep-th/0103195.
[48] M. Reuter and H. Weyer, Phys. Rev. D**69**, 104022 (2004), hep-th/0311196.
[49] M. Reuter and H. Weyer, JCAP**0412**, 001 (2004), hep-th/0410119.
[50] A. Codello, R. Percacci and C. Rahmede, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A**23**, 143 (2008), arXiv:0705.1769.
[51] D. Benedetti, P. F. Machado and F. Saueressig, Mod. Phys. Lett. A**24**, 2233 (2009), arXiv:0901.2984; Nucl. Phys. B**824**, 168 (2010), arXiv:0902.4630.
[52] M. R. Niedermaier, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 101303 (2009).
[53] D. Benedetti and F. Caravelli, JHEP**1206**, 017 (2012) [Erratum-ibid. **1210**, 157 (2012)], arXiv:1204.3541.
[54] J. A. Dietz and T. R. Morris, JHEP**1301**, 108 (2013), arXiv:1211.0955.
[55] S. Nagy, J. Krizsan and K. Sailer, JHEP**1207**, 102 (2012), arXiv:1203.6564.
[56] N. Christiansen, D. F. Litim, J. M. Pawlowski and A. Rodigast, arXiv:1209.4038.
[57] M. Demmel, F. Saueressig and O. Zanusso, JHEP**1211**, 131 (2012), arXiv:1208.2038.
[58] A. Codello, arXiv:1304.2059.

[59] U. Harst and M. Reuter, JHEP **1105**, 119 (2011) [arXiv:1101.6007 [hep-th]].
[60] A. Eichhorn, H. Gies and M. M. Scherer, Phys. Rev. D**80**, 104003 (2009), arXiv:0907.1828; K. Groh and F. Saueressig, J. Phys. A**43**, 365403 (2010), arXiv:1001.5032; A. Eichhorn and H. Gies, Phys. Rev. D**81**, 104010 (2010), arXiv:1001.5033. A. Eichhorn, Phys. Rev. D**87** 124016 (2013), arXiv:1301.0632.
[61] N. Christiansen, B. Knorr, J. M. Pawlowski and A. Rodigast, arXiv:1403.1232 [hep-th].
[62] B. Koch and P. Rioseco, "New black hole solutions for the improved Einstein-Hilbert-Maxwell action", work in progress; C. Contreras, B. Koch and P. Rioseco, "Coupling flows due to black hole solutions of the Einstein-Hilbert-Maxwell action", work in progress.
[63] A. V. Frolov and J.-Q. Guo, arXiv:1101.4995.
[64] A. Bonanno, Phys. Rev. D**85**, 081503 (2012), arXiv:1203.1962.
[65] M. Hindmarsh and I. D. Saltas, Phys. Rev. D**86**, 064029 (2012), arXiv:1203.3957.
[66] E. J. Copeland, C. Rahmede and I. D. Saltas, arXiv:1311.0881.
[67] K. S. Stelle, Phys. Rev. D **16**, 953 (1977).